

REMARKS

This Amendment is provided in response to the Office Action mailed March 13, 2008. Claims 1, 8, and 11-14 were amended. Claims 2, 3, 9, 10, and 15 were canceled. New claims 16-29 were added. Claims 1, 4-8, 11-14 and 16-29 are pending.

The Office Action

The Examiner objected to claims 1-3, 8-10 and 15 because of informalities. Amendments to pending claims 1 and 8 have been made correcting these informalities.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4-6, 8 and 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2005/0223097 to Ramsayer.

Amended claim 1 new claim 22 claim a method of routing calls having different call types in a 3GPP/3GPP2 wireless communications network. Ramsayer does not teach or suggest routing calls in a 3GPP/3GPP2 wireless communications network.

Claims 1 and 22 claim an IMS CSCF network entity receiving a call request from a calling party multimedia mobile phone via a radio area network. The call request includes the SUDI defining a single point of contact for calls having different call types made to the called party. Claims 1 and 22 also claim determining the call type from the call control protocol and media descriptor contained in the call request, selecting a call-type-specific destination identifier for the call from a plurality of called party destination identifiers based on the call type, performing call setup for the call, and routing the call to the called party using the selected call-type-specific destination identifier.

This is not taught in Ramsayer. Ramsayer teaches using a Personal User Agent (20) providing a group of device agents, each representing a different endpoint, a proxy function in a Packet Data Network (12). The Personal User Agent represents this group of device agents over the network (12) as a single device agent. The Personal User Agent does not execute call setup and does not route the call to the called party in a 3GPP/3GPP2 wireless communications network. The Personal User Agent simply acts as a proxy for several endpoints examining the content information of incoming call messages and sends the call messages to the applicable endpoint device agent as stated in paragraph [0034]. Accordingly, claims 1 and 22, as well as claims 4-7, 16-21 and 23-29 depending therefrom are patentable over Ramsayer.

Amended claim 8 claims an IMS CSCF network entity receiving SUDI call requests for calls having a plurality of different call types, and executing call setups and call session control for the calls.

Further claim 8 claims determining a call type for each call from the corresponding SUDI call request including: "determining if a protocol for the SUDI call request can support multiple call types, wherein if the SUDI call request protocol cannot support multiple call types then determining the call type from the SUDI call request protocol, and wherein if the SUDI call request protocol can support multiple call types then determining the call type from the media descriptor in the SUDI call request". Ramsayer does not teach or suggest determining the call type in this manner. Ramsayer does not teach handling calls in which the protocol cannot support multiple call types. Claim 8, as well as claims 10-14 depending therefrom, are patentable over Ramsayer for these reasons and the reasons stated above with reference to claims 1 and 22.

The Examiner rejected claims 2, 3, 9, 10 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramsayer in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0023730 to Wengrovitz. However, Wengrovitz does not teach a 3GPP/3GPP2 IMS CSCF network entity capable of executing call setups receiving SUDI call requests from a mobile phone via a radio area network. Rather, Wengrovitz teaches the use of a Private Branch Exchange (PBX) unit (36) coupled to a telephone (34).

Also, Wengrovitz does not teach determining a call type for each call as claimed in claims 1, 8 and 22. Instead, Wengrovitz teaches a system for conducting multimedia SIP sessions by splitting the session up in accordance with the type of media being sent, and sending each different type of media to a different endpoint. Further, "the call" is not routed to any one of the endpoints as claimed. Rather, the call is split into portions with each portion pertaining to a different media type, and the media for each portion of the call is sent to a different endpoint. The combination of Ramsayer and Wengrovitz does not teach or suggest this, and thus claims 1, 8 and 22 as well as the pending claims depending therefrom are patentable over the Ramsayer and Wengrovitz.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons detailed above, it is respectfully submitted all claims remaining in the application (Claims 1, 4-8, 11-14 and 16-29) are now in condition for allowance. The foregoing comments do not require unnecessary additional search or examination.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he/she is hereby authorized to telephone Patrick D. Floyd, at (216) 861-5582.

Respectfully submitted,

Fay Sharpe LLP




Patrick D. Floyd, Reg. No. 39,671
1100 Superior Avenue
Seventh Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579
216-861-5582

September 15, 2008

Date

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper and/or fee is being transmitted to the USPTO by electronic transmission via EFS-Web on the date indicated below.



Roseanne Giuliani

Date:

Sept. 15, 2008